



(2017). Search for standard model production of four top quarks with same-sign and multilepton final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *Physics Letters B*, 772, 336-358.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.06.064>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

License (if available):
CC BY

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1016/j.physletb.2017.06.064](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.06.064)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via Elsevier at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2017.06.064> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>



Search for standard model production of four top quarks in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV

The CMS Collaboration*

CERN, Switzerland



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 February 2017

Received in revised form 24 June 2017

Accepted 24 June 2017

Available online 28 June 2017

Editor: M. Doser

Keywords:

CMS

Physics

Top

BSM

ABSTRACT

A search for events containing four top quarks ($t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$) is reported from proton–proton collisions recorded by the CMS experiment at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV and corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 2.6 fb^{-1} . The analysis considers the single-lepton (e or μ)+jets and the opposite-sign dilepton ($\mu^+\mu^-$, $\mu^\pm e^\mp$, or e^+e^-)+jets channels. It uses boosted decision trees to combine information on the global event and jet properties to distinguish between $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ and $t\bar{t}$ production. The number of events observed after all selection requirements is consistent with expectations from background and standard model signal predictions, and an upper limit is set on the cross section for $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production in the standard model of 94 fb at 95% confidence level ($10.2 \times$ the prediction), with an expected limit of 118 fb. This is combined with the results from the published CMS search in the same-sign dilepton channel, resulting in an improved limit of 69 fb at 95% confidence level ($7.4 \times$ the prediction), with an expected limit of 71 fb. These are the strongest constraints on the rate of $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production to date.

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Funded by SCOAP³.

1. Introduction

In proton–proton collisions at the CERN LHC most top quarks are produced in $t\bar{t}$ pairs, with a small contribution from single top quark production. It is also possible, however, to produce four top quarks ($t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$) in the standard model (SM) via higher-order diagrams in quantum chromodynamics (QCD), mainly via gluon fusion, as shown in Fig. 1.

The SM cross section for $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production is approximately five orders of magnitude smaller than that for $t\bar{t}$, and $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production has not yet been observed. Observing $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production consistent with predictions would provide a valuable test of higher-order perturbative QCD calculations. In addition, many models of physics beyond the SM predict an increase in the $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ cross section owing either to the presence of hypothetical particles that decay into top quarks or to modified couplings. These include models with massive colored bosons, Higgs boson and top quark compositeness, or extra dimensions, models with extended scalar sector such as 2HDM models [1], and supersymmetric extensions of the SM [2–8]. Some of these models predict enhancements in the observed $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ cross section, with the associated kinematic distributions remaining similar to those from SM production. This is particularly the

case when no new particles beyond those in the SM are produced on-shell.

At $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, where the SM predicts a cross section ($\sigma_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{SM}}$) of 1.3 fb [9], CMS set a 95% confidence level (CL) upper limit of 32 fb on the production cross section, and comparable results, 23 fb, were obtained by ATLAS [10,11]. At $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, the SM prediction increases to 9.2 fb [9,12], where CMS set a 95% CL upper limit of 119 fb using a same-sign dilepton analysis [13]. The studies presented in this paper are performed in two separate decay modes that are complementary to and statistically independent from the same-sign dilepton analysis. The first analysis examines the final state where only one of the four W bosons from the top quark decays in $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production decays to a muon or electron. This single-lepton final state has the largest branching fraction in $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$




Fig. 1. A representative Feynman diagram for $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production in the SM at lowest order in QCD.

* E-mail address: cms-publication-committee-chair@cern.ch.

production. The second analysis focuses on the opposite-sign dilepton channel with exactly two of any combination of electrons or muons. Both use the 13 TeV data recorded by the CMS experiment in 2015 (corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 2.6 fb^{-1}), and apply multivariate techniques to discriminate between the $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ and $t\bar{t}$ processes. In order to enhance the sensitivity, the search is performed in multiple jet and b jet multiplicity categories.

2. The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS detector is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. A silicon pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter, and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter, each composed of a barrel and two endcap sections, are located within the solenoid volume. Muons are measured in gas-ionization detectors embedded in the steel flux-return yoke outside the solenoid. A two-tier trigger system selects the relevant collisions for offline analysis [14]. A more detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of its coordinate system and kinematic variables, can be found in [15].

3. Data and simulation

Several Monte Carlo (MC) generators are used to simulate the signal and background processes. The $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ signal is simulated using the next-to-leading-order (NLO) MG5_AMC@NLO generator (v2.2.2) [12,16], assuming a top quark mass (m_t) of 172.5 GeV. The $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ cross section is calculated to be $9.2^{+2.9}_{-2.4} \text{ fb}$ [12], where the uncertainty includes contributions from the factorization and renormalization scale uncertainties and the dependence on the choice of parton distribution functions (PDFs).

The dominant background process is $t\bar{t}$ production, which is simulated at NLO using POWHEG v2 [17–20]. The events coming from Drell–Yan ($q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z/\gamma^* \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$, with $\ell = e$ or μ) + jets and W boson + jets production are modeled using MADGRAPH [12], with the MLM matching scheme [21], and up to three jets. Single top quark production and the production of $t\bar{t}$ pairs in conjunction with a Higgs boson give small background contributions, and these are simulated using POWHEG v1. Lastly, the production of a $t\bar{t}$ pair in association with a W or Z boson is modeled using the MG5_AMC@NLO generator. In all of the simulations, the initial- and final-state radiation (ISR and FSR), and the fragmentation and hadronization of quarks are modeled using PYTHIA8.212 [22,23] with the underlying event tune CUETP8M1 [24]. This tune uses a value of 0.137 for the strong coupling $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ in the parton shower simulation, which leads to a mismodeling of the jet multiplicity (N_j) spectrum. All of the simulations are corrected for this effect using factors that depend on the number of observed jets and which are equal to the ratio of the particle-level cross sections calculated assuming $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.137$ and $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.113$. The latter value was derived from a comparison of the predictions of the $t\bar{t}$ simulation and a CMS measurement on an independent $t\bar{t}$ dataset at 8 TeV [25].

Detailed studies show that the contributions of $t\bar{t} + H$, Z boson, or W boson do not significantly affect the sensitivity of the analysis. This combined background is included in the overwhelming $t\bar{t}$ background for the rest of this paper, unless mentioned otherwise. Backgrounds containing Z and W bosons but no top quarks are further referred to as electroweak (EW) backgrounds. Among single top production modes, the only relevant one is the contribution from tW production. All of these backgrounds are included in the analysis but are orders of magnitude smaller than the background originating from $t\bar{t}$ + jets production.

The NNPDF 3.0 and NNPDF_nlo_as_0118 [26] PDFs are used to generate all events, the latter being used for samples created with NLO generators. The simulated samples already include an estimate of the additional pp interactions per bunch crossing (pileup), and further corrections are applied to make the simulation of the number of additional interactions representative of that observed in the data. All of the simulated events are propagated through a simulation of the CMS detector, which is based on GEANT4 (v.9.4) [27]. The $t\bar{t}$ background process is normalized to the next-to-next-to-leading-order cross section [28]. In all other cases, the NLO cross sections are used [29–31].

4. Event selection

The final states considered in this analysis are the single-lepton channel with exactly one muon or electron, and the opposite-sign dilepton channel with exactly $\mu^+\mu^-$, $\mu^\pm e^\mp$, or e^+e^- . These leptons originate from the W bosons from top quark decays and tend to be isolated from jets, unlike leptons produced in the decay of B or other hadrons within jets. Single-lepton events were recorded using a trigger that required at least one isolated muon with $p_T > 18 \text{ GeV}$ or one isolated electron with $p_T > 23 \text{ GeV}$. Dilepton events were recorded using a trigger that required an electron or muon with $p_T > 17 \text{ GeV}$, in combination with a second lepton where the requirement is $p_T > 8 \text{ GeV}$ for a muon and 12 GeV for an electron.

Each event is required to have at least one reconstructed vertex. The primary vertex is chosen as the one with the largest value of $\sum p_T^2$ of the tracks associated with it. Single-lepton events are required to contain exactly one isolated muon or electron with $p_T > 26 \text{ GeV}$ or 30 GeV, respectively, and pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 2.1$. The isolation is ensured by demanding the variable I_{rel} to be below the predefined threshold. The relative isolation, I_{rel} , is defined as the scalar p_T sum of the additional particles emanating from the same vertex as the lepton, within a cone of angular radius $\Delta R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} = 0.4$ around the lepton, divided by the p_T of the lepton, where $\Delta\eta$ and $\Delta\phi$ are the differences in pseudorapidity and azimuthal angle (in radians), respectively, between the directions of the lepton and the additional particle. The sum does not include the p_T of the muon and is corrected for the neutral particle contribution from pileup on an event-by-event basis. Electron candidates are required to satisfy restrictive identification criteria, including isolation, which are described in Ref. [32]. Muons are required to satisfy the criteria described in Ref. [33] and have a relative isolation variable, I_{rel} , smaller than 0.15.

In the dilepton channel, events are required to contain two isolated leptons of opposite charge with $p_T > 20 \text{ GeV}$ or 25 GeV for muons or electrons, respectively, and $|\eta| < 2.4$. Electron candidates are required to satisfy the same identification criteria as in the single-lepton channel. Because of the lower background, the muon isolation requirement is relaxed to $I_{\text{rel}} < 0.25$. In the $\mu\mu$ and ee channels, the lepton pair is also required to have an invariant mass greater than 20 GeV and outside of a 30 GeV window centered on the Z boson mass, to exclude leptons from the decays of low-mass resonances and Z bosons. Events containing additional isolated charged leptons are vetoed.

Jets are reconstructed using a particle-flow algorithm in which the particles are clustered using the anti- k_T algorithm [34,35] with a distance parameter of 0.4. The jet momentum is determined from the vectorial sum of all particle momenta in the jet, and is reconstructed to within 5–10% of the true momentum over the full range of p_T within the detector acceptance, as determined from simulations. An offset correction is applied to jet energies to take into account the contribution from pileup. Jet energy corrections are derived for simulation, and verified using in situ measurements

of the energy balance in dijet and photon+jet events. These corrections are applied as a function of the jet p_T and η to both data and simulated events [36].

A minimum of six or four jets are each required to have $p_T > 30$ GeV and $|\eta| < 2.5$ in the single-lepton or dilepton channel, respectively, with two or more required to be tagged as originating from the hadronization of b quarks (b jets) using the combined secondary vertex (CSV) algorithm [37]. A working point (“medium”) of the algorithm is chosen to give a misidentification rate of approximately 1% for light-quark and gluon jets, with b tagging efficiencies of 40–75% depending on the kinematic properties of the jet. In the dilepton channel, events are also required to have $H_T > 500$ GeV, where H_T is defined as the scalar sum of the p_T of all jets. This selection removes a large amount of the $t\bar{t}$ background, while not significantly reducing the expected number of signal events.

The efficiency of the lepton selection is measured using tag-and-probe techniques [38,39]. The simulation is corrected using p_T - and η -dependent scale factors of order unity to provide consistency with the data. The distribution of the CSV discriminant in simulation is corrected to match that observed in data [40,41]. The relative rates of $t\bar{t}+b\bar{b}$ and $t\bar{t}$ +light-quark events in the simulation are corrected to make them consistent with previous measurements [42]. After implementing the complete event selection criteria and all corrections, good consistency in kinematic distributions is found between the data and simulation in both channels. The total number of events selected in the single-electron (muon) channel is 3740 (5600) and 332 events are selected in the dilepton channel. All are consistent with the expected background. Selected events are predominantly (over 97% in the single-lepton channel and 95% in the dilepton channel) expected to be $t\bar{t}$ +jets, with the remaining fraction from single top, Drell–Yan+jets, and W+jets production.

5. Multivariate analysis

Two boosted decision trees (BDTs), implemented using the TMVA library [43–45], are used to improve the discrimination between signal and background. The principal differences between $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ and $t\bar{t}$ production are in the jet multiplicity and the number of b jets. These and the associated kinematic variables feature strongly in the choice of BDT input parameters. This is based on the strategy developed for the CMS $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV analysis, and the training uses simulated backgrounds from $t\bar{t}$ +jets and $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production [10].

The first BDT is used to identify combinations of three jets (trijet) consistent with being the product of all-hadronic top quark decays, rather than of other sources such as ISR or FSR. The BDT uses the invariant dijet and trijet masses, b tagging information, and the angles between the three jets as input variables. All possible trijet permutations are ranked according to their BDT discriminant value, from highest to lowest. In the dilepton channel, the $t\bar{t}$ background contains no hadronic top decays, so the BDT output for the first-ranked trijet ($T_{\text{trijet}1}$) is used as the discriminant. In the single-lepton channel, each background event contains a genuine hadronic top quark decay, so the jets included in $T_{\text{trijet}1}$ are removed and the highest-ranked BDT discriminant using the remaining jets ($T_{\text{trijet}2}$) is used.

The second BDT, with discriminants $D_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{lj}}$ for the single-lepton channel and $D_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{dijl}}$ for the dilepton channel, takes the discriminant from the trijet associations as one of its input parameters. Additional inputs are then optimized separately for the two channels and are based on the characteristics of the lepton and jet activity in the events. Not all inputs are used by both analyses. These

are grouped into three categories: event activity, event topology, and b quark multiplicity. Although many of these are correlated, each one contributes some additional discrimination between the $t\bar{t}$ background and the $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ signal.

Comparison of simulated $t\bar{t}$ and $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ events leads to the selection of the following event activity variables:

1. The number of jets present in the event, N_j .
2. Weighted jet multiplicity (N_j^w), based on both the jet multiplicity and the p_T distribution of the jets. This quantity is sensitive to the differences between the p_T spectra of the jets from top quark decays and those originating from gluon radiation, having higher values in events with many high- p_T jets than in events where only a few jets have high p_T and the rest are close to the selection threshold. It is defined as

$$N_j^w = \frac{\int_{30}^{125} N_j(p_T > p_T^{\text{th}}) p_T^{\text{th}} dp_T^{\text{th}}}{\int_{30}^{125} p_T^{\text{th}} dp_T^{\text{th}}} \quad (1)$$

$$= \frac{1}{14725 \text{ GeV}^2} \sum_{i=0}^{N_j} N_j(p_T > p_T^i) (p_T^{\text{th}})^2 \Big|_{p_T^i}^{p_T^{i+1}}$$

where the limits of integration are in GeV and $N_j(p_T > p_T^{\text{th}})$ is the number of jets with p_T above a threshold p_T^{th} , while $p_T^0 = 30$ GeV, $p_T^i (p_T^{i+1} \geq p_T^i)$ is the p_T of the i th jet and $p_T^{N_j+1} = 125$ GeV. The lower limit of 30 GeV is driven by the minimum p_T requirements on the jets, while the upper limit of 125 GeV is chosen since above this value, there are few events and increasing the upper limit on p_T^{th} would not significantly affect the sensitivity of N_j^w .

3. The variable H_T^b , defined as the scalar sum of the p_T of all jets that are identified as b jets by the CSV algorithm, applied at its medium working point.
4. The ratio (H_T^{ratio}) of the H_T of the four highest- p_T jets in the event in the single-lepton, or the two highest- p_T jets in the dilepton channel, to the H_T of the other jets in the event.
5. The quantity H_T^{2m} , defined as the H_T in the event minus the scalar sum of the p_T of the two highest- p_T b jets.
6. The transverse momenta of the jets with the third- and fourth-largest p_T in the event (p_T^3 and p_T^4).
7. The reduced event mass (M_{red}^h), defined as the invariant mass of the system comprising all the jets in the reduced event, where the reduced event is constructed by subtracting the jets contained in $T_{\text{trijet}1}$ in single-lepton events. In $t\bar{t}$ events, the reduced event will typically only contain the b jet from the semileptonic top quark decay and jets arising from ISR and FSR. Conversely, a reduced $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ event can contain up to two hadronic top quarks and, as a result, numerous energetic jets.
8. The reduced event $H_T(H_T^x)$. This is defined as the H_T of all jets in the single-lepton event selection excluding those contained in $T_{\text{trijet}1}$.

The event topology is characterized by the variables:

1. Event sphericity (S) [46], calculated from all of the jets in the event in terms of the tensor $S^{\alpha\beta} = \sum_i p_i^\alpha p_i^\beta / \sum_i |\vec{p}_i|^2$, where α and β refer to the three-components of the momentum of the i th jet. The sphericity is then $S = (3/2)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)$, where λ_2 and λ_3 are the two smallest eigenvalues of $S^{\alpha\beta}$. The sphericity in $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ events should differ from that in background $t\bar{t}$ events of the same energy, since the jets in $t\bar{t}$ events will be less isotropically distributed because of their recoil from sources such as ISR.




Fig. 2. Distribution of the event-level BDT discriminants $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{lj}}$ for the μ +jets (left) and e +jets (right) final states from data and the estimated background contributions from simulation, in the $N_j \geq 9$ and $3 N_{\text{tags}}^m$ (upper panels) and the $N_j \geq 9$ and $\geq 4 N_{\text{tags}}^m$ categories (lower panels). The vertical bars show the statistical uncertainties in the data. The predicted background distributions from simulation are shown by the shaded histograms. The hatched area shows the size of the dominant systematic uncertainty in the simulation, which comes from the matrix-element (ME) factorization and renormalization scales used in the simulation. The expected SM $\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{t}}$ signal contribution is shown by open histogram, multiplied by a factor of 20.

2. Hadronic centrality (C), defined as the value of H_T divided by the sum of the energies of all jets in the event.

Since all the previous variables rely only on the hadronic information in the event, sensitivity to the lepton information is provided through the p_T and η of the highest- p_T lepton (or only lepton for the single-lepton channel) ($p_T^1, \eta^{\ell 1}$) and the angular difference ($\Delta R_{\ell\ell}$) between the leptons in dilepton events. Finally, the b jet multiplicity is characterized in terms of the number of b jets tagged by the CSV algorithm operating at its loose [40] (N_{tags}^1) and medium (N_{tags}^m) operating points, and the angular separation ΔR_{bb} between the b-tagged jets with the highest CSV discriminants, and the third- and fourth-highest discriminant values.

The event-level discriminants $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{lj}}$ and $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ are optimized separately, resulting in the choice of different sets of variables. For the single-lepton channel, the optimal variable set, in order of sensitivity, is found to be N_j , $T_{\text{trijet}2}$, H_T^b , H_T^{ratio} , $p_T^{\ell 1}$, N_j^w , M_{red}^h , H_T^x , and the third- and fourth-highest CSV discriminants. In the dilepton channel, the optimal variable set, in order of sensitivity, is N_j , N_j^w , S , $T_{\text{trijet}1}$, N_{tags}^1 , N_{tags}^m , ΔR_{bb} , H_T^b , $p_T^{\ell 1}$, $\eta^{\ell 1}$, H_T^{ratio} , H_T^m , $\Delta R_{\ell\ell}$, C, p_T^j , and p_T^j . The MC modeling of the individual observables utilized in the discriminants $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{lj}}$ and $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ was verified using control samples of $\text{t}\bar{\text{t}}$ events and found to be in agreement with the data in all the jet multiplicities and b tag multiplicities.

To further improve the sensitivity of the analyses, the data are split into exclusive jet multiplicity categories. The single-lepton analysis uses categories of $N_j = 6, 7, 8$, and ≥ 9 . The dilepton channel, with fewer events, uses only the 4–5, 6–7, and ≥ 8 jet categories. A further division into exclusive b jet multiplicities is possible only for the single-lepton analysis, where the N_j cate-

gories are subdivided into categories with $N_{\text{tags}}^m = 2, 3$, and ≥ 4 .

Fig. 2 shows $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{lj}}$ in the μ +jets and e +jets channels for two of the most sensitive categories, and Fig. 3 shows the $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ distributions for the dilepton channel.

The distributions of the discriminants $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{lj}}$ and $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ are fitted simultaneously for each N_j and N_{tags}^m bin. For the single-lepton channel the fit is also performed separately for the μ +jets and e +jets events. In the three dilepton channels ($\mu^+\mu^-$, $\mu^\pm e^\mp$, e^+e^-), the $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ distributions are found to be consistent, and they are combined to improve the statistical precision. In all cases good agreement is observed between the data and the simulated background, and the results from each of the channels are combined to obtain an upper limit on the $\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{t}}$ production cross section.

6. Sources of systematic uncertainty

The systematic uncertainties affecting the analyses are grouped into normalization and shape categories, depending on their effect on the event-level BDT discriminant distribution. While all normalization uncertainties apply to both the signal and all the background simulations, the shape uncertainties are only considered for the $\text{t}\bar{\text{t}}$ background and the $\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{t}}$ signal. These include effects related to the change in normalization owing to changes in the shape. The normalization uncertainties are:

1. An uncertainty of 2.3% [47] in the integrated luminosity.
2. The uncertainty in the theoretical $\text{t}\bar{\text{t}}$ cross section dominates the uncertainty in the predicted event yields, since the $\text{t}\bar{\text{t}}$ process dominates the selected data samples. This cross section is taken from Ref. [48], and includes uncertainties of $^{+2.5}_{-3.4}\%$.




Fig. 3. Distribution of the event-level BDT discriminants $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ for the combined dilepton ($\mu^+\mu^- + \mu^\pm e^\mp + e^+e^-$) event sample for 4–5 jets (top), 6–7 jets (middle), and ≥ 8 jets (bottom). The vertical bars show the statistical uncertainty in the data. The predicted background distributions from simulation are shown by the shaded histograms. The hatched area shows the size of the dominant systematic uncertainty in the simulation, which comes from the choice of the matrix-element (ME) factorization and renormalization scales used in the simulation. The electroweak (EW) histogram is the sum of the Drell–Yan and W boson+jets backgrounds. The expected SM $\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}$ signal contribution is shown by the open histogram, multiplied by a factor of 20.

(renormalization and factorization scale) and $^{+6.2\%}_{-6.4\%}$ (PDF). The effect of uncertainties in the cross sections for the other backgrounds were checked and found to be negligible.

3. The uncertainties from trigger, lepton identification, and lepton isolation corrections, which are included as nuisance parameters in determining the upper limit. Combined, these give an uncertainty of 1.2% in the single-muon channel, 3.7% in the single-electron channel, 4.3% in the $\mu\mu$ channel, 4.6% in the μe channel, and 4.8% in the ee channel.

The shape uncertainties are:

1. The uncertainty from the choice of the factorization and renormalization scales in the calculation of the matrix element of

the hard-scattering process, which is estimated by the maximum variation in the $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ or $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{lj}}$ distribution obtained when each scale is changed separately by a factor of 1/2 and 2, excluding unphysical anticorrelated combinations. This procedure is performed separately for the $\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}$ signal and the tt background. In addition, alternative tt samples are used to estimate the impact of a change in the scale at the parton-shower level, taking into account the uncertainty in α_s for the hadronization [25]. The differences in the distributions with respect to the nominal ones are taken as the uncertainty. The uncertainty in the matrix-element scale is the dominant systematic uncertainty in the analysis.

2. Differences in the simulation of tt from the choice of the matrix-element generator, which is estimated by comparing the nominal tt simulation using POWHEG + PYTHIA 8 to samples generated using MADGRAPH + PYTHIA 8 with MLM matching [16]. The difference relative to the nominal simulation is used to estimate the uncertainty from this source.
3. The uncertainty in the fraction of $\text{tt}\bar{\text{b}}\bar{\text{b}}$ events in the tt background, which is estimated using the uncertainty in the measured cross section ratio $\sigma_{\text{tt}\bar{\text{b}}\bar{\text{b}}} : \sigma_{\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{t}}}$ [42] that was used to correct the $\text{tt}\bar{\text{b}}\bar{\text{b}}$ content of the tt simulation. An anticorrelated uncertainty in the measured cross section ratio of $(\sigma_{\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{t}}} - \sigma_{\text{tt}\bar{\text{b}}\bar{\text{b}}}) : \sigma_{\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{t}}}$ is applied simultaneously to the light-quark fraction to maintain the total tt cross section.
4. The uncertainties in the jet energy scale and the jet energy resolution [49], which are estimated by varying these within their uncertainties by ± 1 standard deviation. A similar method is used to estimate the uncertainty from the inelastic proton–proton cross section and the procedure used in the pileup reweighting. These uncertainties have very little influence on the final limit.
5. The uncertainty in the corrections to the values of the b tagging CSV discriminator, where three categories of systematic uncertainty are applied for each jet flavor: the jet energy scale, purity of the data sample used to derive the corrections, and the statistical uncertainties derived from the fits used in the method. The uncertainty in the b tagging correction caused by the jet energy scale is treated as fully correlated with the jet energy scale uncertainty described above. Typical magnitudes of each of these individual uncertainties on the corrections to the b tagging CSV discriminator are 10–50% before the fit, depending on the number of jets and b jets in the event. A full description of these corrections can be found in Ref. [41].

Each systematic source was attributed a nuisance parameter in the limit determination.

7. Results

No deviation from the background-only simulation, which includes tt production and negligible single top, $\text{tt}+\text{H}/\text{Z}/\text{W}$ boson, Drell–Yan+jets, and W+jets backgrounds, is observed in the $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{dil}}$ or $D_{\text{ttt}}^{\text{lj}}$ distributions. An upper limit is derived for the $\text{tt}\bar{\text{t}}$ production cross section using the asymptotic approximation of the CL_s method provided in Refs. [50–54]. The signal and background distributions are fitted using a simultaneous maximum-likelihood method. The normalization uncertainties are included using log-normal functions and the shape uncertainties are included as Gaussian-distributed nuisance parameters. The expected and observed 95% CL upper limits from the two analyses and their combination are listed in Table 1. For the combination of the single-lepton and opposite-sign dilepton results, the systematic uncertainties attributed to the integrated luminosity, jet energy scale, and modeling of the pileup contribution are assumed

Table 1

Expected and observed 95% CL upper limits on SM $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production as a multiple of $\sigma_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{SM}}$ and in fb. The results for the two analyses from this paper are shown separately and combined. The result from a previous CMS measurement [13] is also given, along with the overall limits when the three measurements are combined. The values quoted for the uncertainties on the expected limits are the one standard deviation values and include all statistical and systematic uncertainties.

Channel	Expected limit ($\times\sigma_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{SM}}$)	Observed limit ($\times\sigma_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{SM}}$)	Expected limit (fb)	Observed limit (fb)
Single lepton	$16.4^{+9.8}_{-5.7}$	17.2	151^{+90}_{-52}	158
Dilepton (opposite sign)	$24.7^{+16.7}_{-9.2}$	14.5	227^{+154}_{-84}	134
Combined (this analysis)	$12.8^{+8.3}_{-4.5}$	10.2	118^{+76}_{-41}	94
Dilepton (same sign [13])	$11.0^{+6.2}_{-3.8}$	12.9	101^{+57}_{-35}	119
Combined	$7.7^{+4.1}_{-2.6}$	7.4	71^{+38}_{-24}	69

to be fully correlated. All other systematic uncertainties are assumed to be uncorrelated, but taking them as fully correlated does not modify the expected limit. The likelihood function for the single and opposite-sign dilepton limit has 24 nuisance parameters corresponding to the sources of systematic uncertainties that are described above. The combination with the like-sign dilepton analysis, which is described below, adds 19 additional nuisance parameters specific to Ref. [13]. The data are able to significantly constrain the parameters corresponding to the ME generator choice and the parton shower scale. All of the post-fit nuisance parameter values were found to be consistent with their initial values to well within their quoted uncertainties.

The combined observed 95% CL upper limits on the cross section for four-top-quark production measured in the single-lepton, dilepton, and combined results are shown in Table 1. To cross-check the increase in sensitivity of the multivariate approach, the analysis is performed in the single-lepton channel using the same event categorization, but only the H_T distributions in place of $D_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{li}}$. The expected limit increases by approximately 20%, thus justifying the use of the more complicated BDT analyses.

CMS has also produced an upper limit on the $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ cross section from the analysis of the like-sign dilepton channel [13]. The limit from the analysis is also shown in Table 1. To improve sensitivity, the results from this search are combined with the results from that analysis. For this combination, in addition to the assumed correlations described above, the uncertainty in the modeling of the response of the CMS trigger system to dilepton events is treated as correlated between the opposite-sign and like-sign dilepton analyses. A combined upper limit for the SM $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ cross section is listed in Table 1.

8. Summary

In summary, a search has been performed for events containing four top quarks using data recorded by the CMS experiment in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $\sqrt{s} = 2.6 \text{ fb}^{-1}$. The final states considered in the analysis are the single-lepton channel with exactly one electron or muon, and the opposite-sign dilepton channel with exactly two of any combination of electrons or muons. A boosted decision tree is used to discriminate between the $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ signal and the $t\bar{t}$ background, and no signal is observed. This leads to an upper limit on the SM production cross section for $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ of 94 fb ($10.2\sigma_{t\bar{t}t\bar{t}}^{\text{SM}}$), with an expected limit of 118^{+76}_{-41} fb at the 95% confidence level. This result is combined with a previous search [13] with similar sensitivity in the same-sign dilepton channel to obtain an improved limit of 69 fb, with an expected limit of 71^{+38}_{-24} fb. This is the most stringent limit on $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ production at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV published to date.

Acknowledgements

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMWFW and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MOST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT, and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); OTKA and NIH (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, RosAtom, RAS, RFBR and RAEP (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI, CPAN, PCTI and FEDER (Spain); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEP-Center, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU and SFFR (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (USA).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and EPLANET (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A. P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l'Industrie et dans l'Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, European Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Programa Clarín-COFUND del Principado de Asturias; the Thalís and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); and the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845.

References

- [1] G.C. Branco, et al., Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models, *Phys. Rep. D* 516 (2012) 1, arXiv:1106.0034.
- [2] M. Tahiria, J.D. Wells, Gluino decays with heavier scalar superpartners, *JHEP* 02 (2006) 015, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2006/02/015>, arXiv:hep-ph/0503175.
- [3] K. Kumar, T.M.P. Tait, R. Vega-Morales, Manifestations of top compositeness at colliders, *JHEP* 05 (2009) 022, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2009/05/022>, arXiv:0901.3808.
- [4] S. Calvet, B. Fuks, P. Gris, L. Valery, Searching for sgluons in multijet events at a center-of-mass energy of 8 TeV, *JHEP* 04 (2013) 043, arXiv:1212.3360.
- [5] G. Cacciapaglia, H. Cai, A. Deandrea, T. Flacke, S.J. Lee, A. Parolini, Composite scalars at the LHC: the Higgs, the Sextet and the Octet, *JHEP* 11 (2015) 201, arXiv:1507.02283.
- [6] O. Ducu, L. Heurtier, J. Maurer, LHC signatures of a Z' mediator between dark matter and the SU(3) sector, *JHEP* 03 (2016) 006, arXiv:1509.05615.
- [7] C. Arina, M. Backović, E. Conte, B. Fuks, J. Guo, J. Heisig, B. Hespel, M. Krämer, F. Maltoni, A. Martini, K. Mawatari, M. Pellen, E. Vryonidou, A comprehensive approach to dark matter studies: exploration of simplified top-philic models, *JHEP* 11 (2016) 111, arXiv:1605.09242.
- [8] Q.-H. Cao, S.-L. Chen, Y. Liu, Probing Higgs width and top quark Yukawa coupling from $t\bar{t}h$ and $t\bar{t}t\bar{t}$ productions, *Phys. Rev. D* 95 (2017) 053004, arXiv:1602.01934.
- [9] G. Bevilacqua, M. Worek, Constraining BSM physics at the LHC: Four top final states with NLO accuracy in perturbative QCD, *JHEP* 07 (2012) 111, arXiv:1206.3064.
- [10] CMS Collaboration, Search for standard model production of four top quarks in the lepton+jets channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, *JHEP* 11 (2014) 154, arXiv:1409.7339.
- [11] ATLAS Collaboration, Search for production of vector-like quark pairs and of four top quarks in the lepton-plus-jets final state in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, *JHEP* 08 (2015) 105, arXiv:1505.04306.
- [12] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, H.S. Shao, T. Stelzer, P. Torrielli, M. Zaro, The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations, *JHEP* 07 (2014) 079, arXiv:1405.0301.
- [13] CMS Collaboration, Search for new physics in same-sign dilepton events in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 76 (2016) 439, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4261-z>, arXiv:1605.03171.
- [14] CMS Collaboration, The CMS trigger system, *JINST* 12 (2017) P01020, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/01/P01020>, arXiv:1609.02366.
- [15] CMS Collaboration, The CMS experiment at the CERN LHC, *JINST* 3 (2008) S08004, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/3/08/S08004>.
- [16] M.L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, M. Treccani, Matching matrix elements and shower evolution for top-quark production in hadronic collisions, *JHEP* 01 (2007) 013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/01/013>, arXiv:hep-ph/0611129.
- [17] P. Nason, A new method for combining NLO QCD with shower Monte Carlo algorithms, *JHEP* 11 (2004) 040, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/040>, arXiv:hep-ph/0409146.
- [18] S. Frixione, P. Nason, C. Oleari, Matching NLO QCD computations with parton shower simulations: the POWHEG method, *JHEP* 11 (2007) 070, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2007/11/070>, arXiv:0709.2092.
- [19] S. Alioli, P. Nason, C. Oleari, E. Re, A general framework for implementing NLO calculations in shower Monte Carlo programs: the POWHEG BOX, *JHEP* 06 (2010) 043, arXiv:1002.2581.
- [20] S. Alioli, S.-O. Moch, P. Uwer, Hadronic top-quark pair-production with one jet and parton showering, *JHEP* 01 (2012) 137, arXiv:1110.5251.
- [21] J. Alwall, S. Höche, F. Krauss, N. Lavesson, L. Lönnblad, F. Maltoni, M.L. Mangano, M. Moretti, C.G. Papadopoulos, F. Piccinini, S. Schumann, M. Treccani, J. Winter, M. Worek, Comparative study of various algorithms for the merging of parton showers and matrix elements in hadronic collisions, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 53 (2008) 473, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0490-5>, arXiv:0706.2569.
- [22] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P. Skands, PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual, *JHEP* 05 (2006) 026, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/026>, arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [23] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, P. Skands, A brief introduction to PYTHIA 8.1, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* 178 (2008) 852, arXiv:0710.3820.
- [24] CMS Collaboration, Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 76 (2016) 155, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-3988-x>, arXiv:1512.00815.
- [25] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of $t\bar{t}$ production with additional jet activity, including b quark jets, in the dilepton decay channel using pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 76 (2016) 379, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4105-x>, arXiv:1510.03072.
- [26] R.D. Ball, V. Bertone, F. Cerutti, L. Del Debbio, S. Forte, A. Guffanti, J.J. Latorre, J. Rojo, M. Ubiali (NNPDF), Unbiased global determination of parton distributions and their uncertainties at NNLO and at LO, *Nucl. Phys. B* 855 (2012) 153, arXiv:1107.2652.
- [27] S. Agostinelli, et al., GEANT4, GEANT4—a simulation toolkit, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* 506 (2003) 250, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(03\)01368-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(03)01368-8).
- [28] M. Czakon, A. Mitov, Top++: A program for the calculation of the top-pair cross-section at hadron colliders, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 185 (2014) 2930, arXiv:1112.5675.
- [29] M. Aliev, H. Lacker, U. Langenfeld, S. Moch, P. Uwer, M. Wiedermann, HATHOR: HAdronic Top and Heavy quarks cross section calculator, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 182 (2011) 1034, arXiv:1007.1327.
- [30] P. Kant, O.M. Kind, T. Kintscher, T. Lohse, T. Martini, S. Mölbitz, P. Rieck, P. Uwer, HatHor for single top-quark production: Updated predictions and uncertainty estimates for single top-quark production in hadronic collisions, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 191 (2015) 74, arXiv:1406.4403.
- [31] J.M. Campbell, J.W. Huston, W.J. Stirling, Hard interactions of quarks and gluons: a primer for LHC physics, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* 70 (2007) 89, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/70/1/R02>, arXiv:hep-ph/0611148.
- [32] CMS Collaboration, Performance of electron reconstruction and selection with the CMS detector in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, *JINST* 10 (2015) P06005, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/10/06/P06005>, arXiv:1502.02701.
- [33] CMS Collaboration, Performance of CMS muon reconstruction in pp collision events at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, *JINST* 7 (2012) P10002, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/7/10/P10002>, arXiv:1206.4071.
- [34] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, The anti- k_t jet clustering algorithm, *JHEP* 04 (2008) 063, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/063>, arXiv:0802.1189.
- [35] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam, G. Soyez, Fastjet user manual, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 72 (2012) 1896, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1896-2>, arXiv:1111.6097.
- [36] CMS Collaboration, Determination of jet energy calibration and transverse momentum resolution in CMS, *JINST* 6 (2011) P11002, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/6/11/P11002>, arXiv:1107.4277.
- [37] CMS Collaboration, Identification of b quark jets at the CMS experiment in the LHC Run 2, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-BTV-15-001, <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/2138504>, 2016.
- [38] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section in the dilepton channel in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, *JHEP* 11 (2012) 067, arXiv:1208.2671.
- [39] CMS Collaboration, Measurements of inclusive W and Z cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV, *JHEP* 01 (2011) 080, arXiv:1012.2466.
- [40] CMS Collaboration, Identification of b-quark jets with the CMS experiment, *JINST* 8 (2013) P04013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/8/04/P04013>, arXiv:1211.4462.
- [41] CMS Collaboration, Search for the associated production of the Higgs boson with a top-quark pair, *JHEP* 09 (2014) 087, arXiv:1408.1682, Erratum: 10.1007/JHEP10(2014)106.
- [42] CMS Collaboration, Measurement of the cross section ratio $\sigma_{t\bar{t}b\bar{b}}/\sigma_{t\bar{t}jj}$ in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, *Phys. Lett. B* 746 (2015) 132, arXiv:1411.5621.
- [43] L. Breiman, J. Friedman, R.A. Olshen, C.J. Stone, *Classification and Regression Trees*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 1984.
- [44] H.J. Friedman, Recent advances in predictive (machine) learning, *J. Classif.* 23 (2006) 175, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00357-006-0012-4>.
- [45] H. Voss, A. Höcker, J. Stelzer, F. Tegenfeldt, TMVA, the toolkit for multivariate data analysis with ROOT, in: *XIth International Workshop on Advanced Computing and Analysis Techniques in Physics Research (ACAT)*, 2007, p. 40, http://pos.sissa.it/archive/conferences/050/040/ACAT_040.pdf, arXiv:physics/0703039.
- [46] J.D. Bjorken, S.J. Brodsky, Statistical model for electron–positron annihilation into hadrons, *Phys. Rev. D* 1 (1970) 1416, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.1.1416>.
- [47] CMS Collaboration, CMS luminosity measurement for the 2015 data-taking period, CMS Physics Analysis Summary CMS-PAS-LUM-15-001, <http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/2138682>, 2016.
- [48] M. Czakon, P. Fiedler, A. Mitov, Total top-quark pair-production cross section at hadron colliders through $O(\alpha_s^3)$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110 (2013) 252004, arXiv:1303.6254.
- [49] CMS Collaboration, Jet energy scale and resolution in the CMS experiment in pp collisions at 8 TeV, *J. Instrum.* 12 (2017) P02014, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1748-0221/12/02/P02014>, arXiv:1607.03663.
- [50] L. Moneta, K. Belasco, K.S. Cranmer, S. Kreiss, A. Lazzaro, D. Piparo, G. Schott, W. Verkerke, M. Wolf, The RooStats Project, in: *13th International Workshop on Advanced Computing and Analysis Techniques in Physics Research (ACAT2010)*, ACAT2010, 2010, p. 057, arXiv:1009.1003.
- [51] A.L. Read, Presentation of search results: the CL_s technique, *J. Phys. G* 28 (2002) 2693, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0954-3889/28/20/313>.
- [52] T. Junk, Confidence level computation for combining searches with small statistics, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A, Accel. Spectrom. Detect. Assoc. Equip.* 434 (1999) 435, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002\(99\)00498-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-9002(99)00498-2), arXiv:hep-ex/9902006.

- [53] G. Cowan, K. Cranmer, E. Gross, O. Vitells, Asymptotic formulae for likelihood-based tests of new physics, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 71 (2011) 1554, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1554-0>, arXiv:1007.1727.
- [54] The ATLAS Collaboration, CMS Collaboration, LHC Higgs Combination Group, Procedure for the LHC Higgs boson search combination in Summer 2011, <https://cds.cern.ch/record/1379837>, 2011.

The CMS Collaboration

A.M. Sirunyan, A. Tumasyan

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

W. Adam, E. Asilar, T. Bergauer, J. Brandstetter, E. Brondolin, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, M. Flechl, M. Friedl, R. Frühwirth¹, V.M. Ghete, C. Hartl, N. Hörmann, J. Hrubec, M. Jeitler¹, A. König, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Matsushita, I. Mikulec, D. Rabadý, N. Rad, B. Rahbaran, H. Rohringer, J. Schieck¹, J. Strauss, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

O. Dvornikov, V. Makarenko, V. Mossolov, J. Suarez Gonzalez, V. Zykunov

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

N. Shumeiko

National Centre for Particle and High Energy Physics, Minsk, Belarus

S. Alderweireldt, E.A. De Wolf, X. Janssen, J. Lauwers, M. Van De Klundert, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, N. Van Remortel, A. Van Spilbeeck

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

S. Abu Zeid, F. Blekman, J. D'Hondt, N. Daci, I. De Bruyn, K. Deroover, D. Lontkovskyi, S. Lowette, S. Moortgat, L. Moreels, A. Olbrechts, Q. Python, K. Skovpen, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders, I. Van Parijs

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

H. Brun, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, G. Fasanella, L. Favart, R. Goldouzian, A. Grebenyuk, G. Karapostoli, T. Lenzi, A. Léonard, J. Luetic, T. Maerschalk, A. Marinov, A. Randle-conde, T. Seva, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom, R. Yonamine, F. Zenoni, F. Zhang²

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

A. Cimmino, T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, A. Fagot, M. Gul, I. Khvastunov, D. Poyraz, S. Salva, R. Schöffbeck, M. Tytgat, W. Van Driessche, E. Yazgan, N. Zaganidis

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

H. Bakhshiansohi, C. Beluffi³, O. Bondu, S. Brochet, G. Bruno, A. Caudron, S. De Visscher, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, B. Francois, A. Giammanco, A. Jafari, M. Komm, G. Krintiras, V. Lemaitre, A. Magitteri, A. Mertens, M. Musich, K. Piotrkowski, L. Quertenmont, M. Selvaggi, M. Vidal Marono, S. Wertz

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

N. Beliy

Université de Mons, Mons, Belgium

W.L. Aldá Júnior, F.L. Alves, G.A. Alves, L. Brito, C. Hensel, A. Moraes, M.E. Pol, P. Rebello Teles

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato⁴, A. Custódio, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁵, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, L.M. Huertas Guativa, H. Malbouisson, D. Matos Figueiredo, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, E.J. Tonelli Manganote⁴, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

S. Ahuja^a, C.A. Bernardes^a, S. Dogra^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, P.G. Mercadante^b, C.S. Moon^a, S.F. Novaes^a, Sandra S. Padula^a, D. Romero Abad^b, J.C. Ruiz Vargas^a

^a *Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil*

^b *Universidade Federal do ABC, São Paulo, Brazil*

A. Aleksandrov, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Rodozov, S. Stoykova, G. Sultanov, M. Vutova

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Dimitrov, I. Glushkov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

W. Fang⁶

Beihang University, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, J.G. Bian, G.M. Chen, H.S. Chen, M. Chen, Y. Chen⁷, T. Cheng, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, Z. Liu, F. Romeo, M. Ruan, S.M. Shaheen, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, C. Wang, Z. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Zhao

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

Y. Ban, G. Chen, Q. Li, S. Liu, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Z. Xu

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China

C. Avila, A. Cabrera, L.F. Chaparro Sierra, C. Florez, J.P. Gomez, C.F. González Hernández, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, J.C. Sanabria

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, P.M. Ribeiro Cipriano, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, T. Susa

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

A. Attikis, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, D. Tsiakkouri

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

M. Finger⁸, M. Finger Jr.⁸

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

E. Carrera Jarrin

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

A.A. Abdelalim^{9,10}, Y. Mohammed¹¹, E. Salama^{12,13}

Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt

M. Kadastik, L. Perrini, M. Raidal, A. Tiko, C. Veelken

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

P. Eerola, J. Pekkanen, M. Voutilainen

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

J. Härkönen, T. Järvinen, V. Karimäki, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén, K. Lassila-Perini, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, P. Luukka, J. Tuominiemi, E. Tuovinen, L. Wendland

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

J. Talvitie, T. Tuuva

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, C. Favaro, F. Ferri, S. Ganjour, S. Ghosh, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, I. Kucher, E. Locci, M. Machet, J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M. Titov

IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

A. Abdulsalam, I. Antropov, S. Baffioni, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, L. Cadamuro, E. Chapon, C. Charlot, O. Davignon, R. Granier de Cassagnac, M. Jo, S. Lisniak, P. Miné, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando, G. Ortona, P. Paganini, P. Pigard, S. Regnard, R. Salerno, Y. Sirois, T. Strebler, Y. Yilmaz, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, IN2P3-CNRS, Palaiseau, France

J.-L. Agram¹⁴, J. Andrea, A. Aubin, D. Bloch, J.-M. Brom, M. Buttignol, E.C. Chabert, N. Chanon, C. Collard, E. Conte¹⁴, X. Coubez, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁴, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, A.-C. Le Bihan, P. Van Hove

Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien (IPHC), Université de Strasbourg, CNRS-IN2P3, Villersbarranne, France

S. Gadrat

Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France

S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, B. Courbon, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, G. Grenier, B. Ille, F. Lagarde, I.B. Laktineh, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, A.L. Pequegnot, S. Perries, A. Popov¹⁵, D. Sabes, V. Sordini, M. Vander Donckt, P. Verdier, S. Viret

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France

T. Toriashvili¹⁶

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze⁸

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

C. Autermann, S. Beranek, L. Feld, M.K. Kiesel, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, M. Preuten, C. Schomakers, J. Schulz, T. Verlage

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany

A. Albert, M. Brodski, E. Dietz-Laursonn, D. Duchardt, M. Endres, M. Erdmann, S. Erdweg, T. Esch, R. Fischer, A. Güth, M. Hamer, T. Hebbeker, C. Heidemann, K. Hoepfner, S. Knutzen, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, S. Mukherjee, M. Olschewski, K. Padeken, T. Pook, M. Radziej, H. Reithler, M. Rieger, F. Scheuch, L. Sonnenschein, D. Teyssier, S. Thüer

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

V. Cherepanov, G. Flügge, B. Kargoll, T. Kress, A. Künsken, J. Lingemann, T. Müller, A. Nehrkorn, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, A. Stahl¹⁷

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, T. Arndt, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, U. Behrens, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁸, A. Campbell, P. Connor, C. Contreras-Campana, F. Costanza, C. Diez Pardos, G. Dolinska, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁹, J. Garay Garcia, A. Geiser, A. Gizhko, J.M. Grados Luyando, A. Grohsjean, P. Gunnellini, A. Harb, J. Hauk, M. Hempel²⁰, H. Jung, A. Kalogeropoulos, O. Karacheban²⁰, M. Kasemann, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, I. Korol, D. Krücker, W. Lange, A. Lelek, T. Lenz, J. Leonard, K. Lipka, A. Lobanov, W. Lohmann²⁰, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, G. Mittag, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, D. Pitzl, R. Placakyte, A. Raspereza, B. Roland, M.Ö. Sahin, P. Saxena, T. Schoerner-Sadenius, S. Spannagel, N. Stefaniuk, G.P. Van Onsem, R. Walsh, C. Wissing

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

V. Blobel, M. Centis Vignali, A.R. Draeger, T. Dreyer, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, J. Haller, M. Hoffmann, A. Junkes, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, T. Lapsien, I. Marchesini, D. Marconi, M. Meyer, M. Niedziela, D. Nowatschin, F. Pantaleo¹⁷, T. Peiffer, A. Perieanu, J. Poehlsen, C. Scharf, P. Schleper, A. Schmidt, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, F.M. Stober, M. Stöver, H. Tholen, D. Troendle, E. Usai, L. Vanelderen, A. Vanhoefer, B. Vormwald

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

M. Akbiyik, C. Barth, S. Baur, C. Baus, J. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, F. Colombo, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, S. Fink, B. Freund, R. Friese, M. Giffels, A. Gilbert, P. Goldenzweig, D. Haitz, F. Hartmann¹⁷, S.M. Heindl, U. Husemann, I. Katkov¹⁵, S. Kudella, H. Mildner, M.U. Mozer, Th. Müller, M. Plagge, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, S. Röcker, F. Roscher, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, G. Sieber, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, S. Wayand, M. Weber, T. Weiler, S. Williamson, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf

Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruhe, Germany

G. Anagnostou, G. Daskalakis, T. Geralis, V.A. Giakoumopoulou, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, I. Topsis-Giotis

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

S. Kesisoglou, A. Panagiotou, N. Saoulidou, E. Tziaferi

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

I. Evangelou, G. Flouris, C. Foudas, P. Kokkas, N. Loukas, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, E. Paradas

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

N. Filipovic, G. Pasztor

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²¹, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi²², A.J. Zsigmond

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²³, A. Makovec, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

M. Bartók²², P. Raics, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Hungary

J.R. Komaragiri*Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bengaluru, India***S. Bahinipati²⁴, S. Bhowmik²⁵, S. Choudhury²⁶, P. Mal, K. Mandal, A. Nayak²⁷, D.K. Sahoo²⁴, N. Sahoo, S.K. Swain***National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar, India***S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, R. Chawla, U. Bhawandeep, A.K. Kalsi, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, R. Kumar, P. Kumari, A. Mehta, M. Mittal, J.B. Singh, G. Walia***Punjab University, Chandigarh, India***Ashok Kumar, A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, S. Keshri, S. Malhotra, M. Naimuddin, N. Nishu, K. Ranjan, R. Sharma, V. Sharma***University of Delhi, Delhi, India***R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, K. Chatterjee, S. Dey, S. Dutt, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, N. Majumdar, A. Modak, K. Mondal, S. Mukhopadhyay, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, A. Roy, D. Roy, S. Roy Chowdhury, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, S. Thakur***Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, Kolkata, India***P.K. Behera***Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India***R. Chudasama, D. Dutta, V. Jha, V. Kumar, A.K. Mohanty¹⁷, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla, A. Topkar***Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India***T. Aziz, S. Dugad, G. Kole, B. Mahakud, S. Mitra, G.B. Mohanty, B. Parida, N. Sur, B. Sutar***Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India***S. Banerjee, R.K. Dewanjee, S. Ganguly, M. Guchait, Sa. Jain, S. Kumar, M. Maity²⁵, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, T. Sarkar²⁵, N. Wickramage²⁸***Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India***S. Chauhan, S. Dube, V. Hegde, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, S. Sharma***Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India***S. Chenarani²⁹, E. Eskandari Tadavani, S.M. Etesami²⁹, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, S. Paktinat Mehdiabadi³⁰, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi, B. Safarzadeh³¹, M. Zeinali***Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran***M. Felcini, M. Grunewald***University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland***M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, C. Caputo^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^{a,b}, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, A. Sharma^a, L. Silvestris^{a,17}, R. Venditti^{a,b}, P. Verwilligen^a**^a INFN Sezione di Bari, Bari, Italy^b Università di Bari, Bari, Italy^c Politecnico di Bari, Bari, Italy

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, L. Brigliadori^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, S.S. Chhibra^{a,b}, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, D. Fasanella^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, A. Montanari^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^{a,b,17}

^a INFN Sezione di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

^b Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

S. Albergo^{a,b}, S. Costa^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia^a, F. Giordano^{a,b}, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Catania, Catania, Italy

^b Università di Catania, Catania, Italy

G. Barbagli^a, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, L. Russo^{a,32}, G. Sguazzoni^a, D. Strom^a, L. Viliani^{a,b,17}

^a INFN Sezione di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

^b Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, F. Fabbri, D. Piccolo, F. Primavera¹⁷

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

V. Calvelli^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, M.R. Monge^{a,b}, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Genova, Genova, Italy

^b Università di Genova, Genova, Italy

L. Brianza^{a,b,17}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, S. Fiorendi^{a,b,17}, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, M. Malberti^{a,b}, S. Malvezzi^a, R.A. Manzoni^{a,b}, D. Menasce^a, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Pigazzini^{a,b}, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

^b Università di Milano-Bicocca, Milano, Italy

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, G. De Nardo, S. Di Guida^{a,d,17}, M. Esposito^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^{a,b}, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, G. Lanza^a, L. Lista^a, S. Meola^{a,d,17}, P. Paolucci^{a,17}, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, F. Thyssen^a

^a INFN Sezione di Napoli, Napoli, Italy

^b Università di Napoli 'Federico II', Napoli, Italy

^c Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

^d Università G. Marconi, Roma, Italy

P. Azzi^{a,17}, N. Bacchetta^a, L. Benato^{a,b}, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, M. Dall'Osso^{a,b}, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, S. Lacaprara^a, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, N. Pozzobon^{a,b}, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, E. Torassa^a, M. Zanetti^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy

^b Università di Padova, Padova, Italy

^c Università di Trento, Trento, Italy

A. Braghieri^a, F. Fallavollita^{a,b}, A. Magnani^{a,b}, P. Montagna^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, V. Re^a, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Salvini^a, I. Vai^{a,b}, P. Vitulo^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

^b Università di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

L. Alunni Solestizi^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b}, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Saha^a, A. Santocchia^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

^b Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy

K. Androsov^{a,32}, P. Azzurri^{a,17}, G. Bagliesi^a, J. Bernardini^a, T. Boccali^a, R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,32}, R. Dell'Orso^a, S. Donato^{a,c}, G. Fedi, A. Giassi^a, M.T. Grippo^{a,32}, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, T. Lomtadze^a, L. Martini^{a,b}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a, A. Rizzi^{a,b}, A. Savoy-Navarro^{a,33}, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a, G. Tonelli^{a,b}, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

^a INFN Sezione di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^b Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

^c Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

L. Barone^{a,b}, F. Cavallari^a, M. Cipriani^{a,b}, D. Del Re^{a,b,17}, M. Diemoz^a, S. Gelli^{a,b}, E. Longo^{a,b}, F. Margaroli^{a,b}, B. Marzocchi^{a,b}, P. Meridiani^a, G. Organtini^{a,b}, R. Paramatti^a, F. Preiato^{a,b}, S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, C. Rovelli^a, F. Santanastasio^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Roma, Roma, Italy

^b Università di Roma, Roma, Italy

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c,17}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, N. Bartosik^a, R. Bellan^{a,b}, C. Biino^a, N. Cartiglia^a, F. Cenna^{a,b}, M. Costa^{a,b}, R. Covarelli^{a,b}, A. Degano^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, L. Finco^{a,b}, B. Kiani^{a,b}, C. Mariotti^a, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, E. Monteil^{a,b}, M. Monteno^a, M.M. Obertino^{a,b}, L. Pacher^{a,b}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a, G.L. Pinna Angioni^{a,b}, F. Ravera^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspa^{a,c}, R. Sacchi^{a,b}, K. Shchelina^{a,b}, V. Sola^a, A. Solano^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a, P. Traczyk^{a,b}

^a INFN Sezione di Torino, Torino, Italy

^b Università di Torino, Torino, Italy

^c Università del Piemonte Orientale, Novara, Italy

S. Belforte^a, M. Casarsa^a, F. Cossutti^a, G. Della Ricca^{a,b}, A. Zanetti^a

^a INFN Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

^b Università di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, M.S. Kim, S. Lee, S.W. Lee, Y.D. Oh, S. Sekmen, D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Republic of Korea

A. Lee

Chonbuk National University, Jeonju, Republic of Korea

H. Kim

Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Republic of Korea

J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, T.J. Kim

Hanyang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, D. Gyun, S. Ha, B. Hong, Y. Jo, Y. Kim, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, S. Lee, J. Lim, S.K. Park, Y. Roh

Korea University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

J. Almond, J. Kim, H. Lee, S.B. Oh, B.C. Radburn-Smith, S.h. Seo, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, G.B. Yu

Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

M. Choi, H. Kim, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, G. Ryu, M.S. Ryu

University of Seoul, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Y. Choi, J. Goh, C. Hwang, J. Lee, I. Yu

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Republic of Korea

V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, J. Vaitkus

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

I. Ahmed, Z.A. Ibrahim, M.A.B. Md Ali³⁴, F. Mohamad Idris³⁵, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁶, A. Hernandez-Almada, R. Lopez-Fernandez, R. Magaña Villalba, J. Mejia Guisao, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, F. Vazquez Valencia

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carpinteyro, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

A. Morelos Pineda

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico

D. Krofcheck

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

P.H. Butler

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, A. Saddique, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, T. Frueboes, M. Górski, M. Kazana, K. Nawrocki, K. Romanowska-Rybinska, M. Szleper, P. Zalewski

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁷, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Misiura, M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

P. Bargassa, C. Beirão Da Cruz E Silva, B. Calpas, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, P.G. Ferreira Parracho, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, L. Lloret Iglesias, M.V. Nemallapudi, J. Rodrigues Antunes, J. Seixas, O. Toldaiev, D. Vadrucio, J. Varela, P. Vischia

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal

S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavin, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{38,39}, V. Palichik, V. Perelygin, S. Shmatov, S. Shulha, N. Skatchkov, V. Smirnov, N. Voytishin, A. Zarubin

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

L. Chtchipounov, V. Golovtsov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim⁴⁰, E. Kuznetsova⁴¹, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, V. Sulimov, A. Vorobyev

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia

Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, D. Tisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia

A. Bylinkin³⁹

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

M. Chadeeva⁴², V. Rusinov, E. Tarkovskii

National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin³⁹, I. Dremin³⁹, M. Kirakosyan, A. Leonidov³⁹, A. Terkulov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

A. Baskakov, A. Belyaev, E. Boos, V. Bunichev, M. Dubinin⁴³, L. Dudko, V. Klyukhin, O. Kodolova, N. Korneeva, I. Lokhtin, I. Miagkov, S. Obraztsov, M. Perfilov, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

V. Blinov⁴⁴, Y. Skovpen⁴⁴, D. Shtol⁴⁴

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, D. Elumakhov, V. Kachanov, A. Kalinin, D. Konstantinov, V. Krychkin, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia

P. Adzic⁴⁵, P. Cirkovic, D. Devetak, M. Dordevic, J. Milosevic, V. Rekovic

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

J. Alcaraz Maestre, M. Barrio Luna, E. Calvo, M. Cerrada, M. Chamizo Llatas, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, A. Escalante Del Valle, C. Fernandez Bedoya, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, P. Garcia-Abia, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, E. Navarro De Martino, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, A. Quintario Olmeda, I. Redondo, L. Romero, M.S. Soares

Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain

J.F. de Trocóniz, M. Missiroli, D. Moran

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

J. Cuevas, J. Fernandez Menendez, I. Gonzalez Caballero, J.R. González Fernández, E. Palencia Cortezon, S. Sanchez Cruz, I. Suárez Andrés, J.M. Vizan Garcia

Universidad de Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, E. Curras, M. Fernandez, J. Garcia-Ferrero, G. Gomez, A. Lopez Virto, J. Marco, C. Martinez Rivero, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Scodellaro, N. Trevisani, I. Vila, R. Vilar Cortabitarte

Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain

D. Abbaneo, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, P. Bloch, A. Bocci, C. Botta, T. Camporesi, R. Castello, M. Cepeda, G. Cerminara, Y. Chen, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, V. Daponte, A. David, M. De Gruttola, A. De Roeck, E. Di Marco⁴⁶, M. Dobson, B. Dorney, T. du Pree, D. Duggan, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, P. Everaerts, S. Fartoukh, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, D. Gigi, K. Gill, M. Girone, F. Glege, D. Gulhan, S. Gundacker, M. Guthoff, P. Harris, J. Hegeman, V. Innocente, P. Janot, J. Kieseler, H. Kirschenmann, V. Knünz, A. Kornmayer¹⁷, M.J. Kortelainen, K. Kousouris,

M. Krammer¹, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, C. Lourenço, M.T. Lucchini, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Martelli, F. Meijers, J.A. Merlin, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, P. Milenovic⁴⁷, F. Moortgat, S. Morovic, M. Mulders, H. Neugebauer, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, A. Racz, T. Reis, G. Rolandi⁴⁸, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, J.B. Sauvan, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Seidel, A. Sharma, P. Silva, P. Sphicas⁴⁹, J. Steggemann, M. Stoye, Y. Takahashi, M. Tosi, D. Treille, A. Triossi, A. Tsirou, V. Veckalns⁵⁰, G.I. Veres²², M. Verweij, N. Wardle, H.K. Wöhri, A. Zagozdinska³⁷, W.D. Zeuner

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

W. Bertl, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

F. Bachmair, L. Bäni, L. Bianchini, B. Casal, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Grab, C. Heidegger, D. Hits, J. Hoss, G. Kasieczka, W. Lustermann, B. Mangano, M. Marionneau, P. Martinez Ruiz del Arbol, M. Masciovecchio, M.T. Meinhard, D. Meister, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pandolfi, J. Pata, F. Pauss, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, M. Quittnat, M. Rossini, M. Schönenberger, A. Starodumov⁵¹, V.R. Tavolaro, K. Theofilatos, R. Wallny

Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, C. Amsler⁵², L. Caminada, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, C. Galloni, A. Hinzmann, T. Hreus, B. Kilminster, J. Ngadiuba, D. Pinna, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, D. Salerno, C. Seitz, Y. Yang, A. Zucchetta

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

V. Candelise, T.H. Doan, Sh. Jain, R. Khurana, M. Konyushikhin, C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Pozdnyakov, S.S. Yu

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

Arun Kumar, P. Chang, Y.H. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, F. Fiori, W.-S. Hou, Y. Hsiung, Y.F. Liu, R.-S. Lu, M. Miñano Moya, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, J.f. Tsai

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

B. Asavapibhop, G. Singh, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand

A. Adiguzel, M.N. Bakirci⁵³, S. Damarseckin, Z.S. Demiroglu, C. Dozen, E. Eskut, S. Girgis, G. Gokbulut, Y. Guler, I. Hos⁵⁴, E.E. Kangal⁵⁵, O. Kara, U. Kiminsu, M. Oglakci, G. Onengut⁵⁶, K. Ozdemir⁵⁷, S. Ozturk⁵³, A. Polatoz, D. Sunar Cerci⁵⁸, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Çukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Turkey

B. Bilin, S. Bilmis, B. Isildak⁵⁹, G. Karapinar⁶⁰, M. Yalvac, M. Zeyrek

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁶¹, O. Kaya⁶², E.A. Yetkin⁶³, T. Yetkin⁶⁴

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak, S. Sen⁶⁵

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

B. Grynyov

Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine

L. Levchuk, P. Sorokin

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine

R. Aggleton, F. Ball, L. Beck, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, M. Grimes, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, J. Jacob, L. Kreczko, C. Lucas, D.M. Newbold⁶⁶, S. Paramesvaran, A. Poll, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-storey, D. Smith, V.J. Smith

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶⁷, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, L. Calligaris, D. Cieri, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

M. Baber, R. Bainbridge, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, D. Burton, S. Casasso, M. Citron, D. Colling, L. Corpe, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, A. De Wit, M. Della Negra, R. Di Maria, P. Dunne, A. Elwood, D. Futyan, Y. Haddad, G. Hall, G. Iles, T. James, R. Lane, C. Laner, R. Lucas⁶⁶, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, L. Mastrolorenzo, J. Nash, A. Nikitenko⁵¹, J. Pela, B. Penning, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, S. Summers, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, M. Vazquez Acosta⁶⁸, T. Virdee¹⁷, J. Wright, S.C. Zenz

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, I.D. Reid, P. Symonds, L. Teodorescu, M. Turner

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

A. Borzou, K. Call, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, H. Liu, N. Pastika

Baylor University, Waco, USA

R. Bartek, A. Dominguez

Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., USA

S.I. Cooper, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, USA

D. Arcaro, A. Avetisyan, T. Bose, D. Gastler, D. Rankin, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, L. Sulak, D. Zou

Boston University, Boston, USA

G. Benelli, D. Cutts, A. Garabedian, J. Hakala, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan, O. Jesus, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, Z. Mao, M. Narain, S. Piperov, S. Sagir, E. Spencer, R. Syarif

Brown University, Providence, USA

R. Breedon, D. Burns, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, S. Chauhan, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, M. Gardner, W. Ko, R. Lander, C. Mclean, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, S. Shalhout, M. Shi, J. Smith, M. Squires, D. Stolp, K. Tos, M. Tripathi

University of California, Davis, Davis, USA

M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, V. Valuev, M. Weber

University of California, Los Angeles, USA

E. Bouvier, K. Burt, R. Clare, J. Ellison, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, J. Heilman, P. Jandir, E. Kennedy, F. Lacroix, O.R. Long, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, A. Shrinivas, W. Si, L. Wang, H. Wei, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, USA

J.G. Branson, G.B. Cerati, S. Cittolin, M. Derdzinski, R. Gerosa, A. Holzner, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, I. Macneill, D. Olivito, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, M. Sani, V. Sharma, S. Simon, M. Tadel, A. Vartak, S. Wasserbaech⁶⁹, C. Welke, J. Wood, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, USA

N. Amin, R. Bhandari, J. Bradmiller-Feld, C. Campagnari, A. Dishaw, V. Dutta, M. Franco Sevilla, C. George, F. Golf, L. Gouskos, J. Gran, R. Heller, J. Incandela, S.D. Mullin, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, J. Richman, D. Stuart, I. Suarez, J. Yoo

University of California, Santa Barbara - Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, USA

D. Anderson, J. Bendavid, A. Bornheim, J. Bunn, J. Duarte, J.M. Lawhorn, A. Mott, H.B. Newman, C. Pena, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, R.Y. Zhu

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA

M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, M. Paulini, J. Russ, M. Sun, H. Vogel, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, USA

J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, F. Jensen, A. Johnson, M. Krohn, T. Mulholland, K. Stenson, S.R. Wagner

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, USA

J. Alexander, J. Chaves, J. Chu, S. Dittmer, K. Mcdermott, N. Mirman, G. Nicolas Kaufman, J.R. Patterson, A. Rinkevicius, A. Ryd, L. Skinnari, L. Soffi, S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, J. Tucker, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

Cornell University, Ithaca, USA

D. Winn

Fairfield University, Fairfield, USA

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, G. Bolla, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, S. Cihangir[†], M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, I. Fisk, J. Freeman, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, D. Hare, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, J. Hirschauer, Z. Hu, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, B. Klima, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, J. Linacre, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, R. Lopes De Sá, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, N. Magini, J.M. Marraffino, S. Maruyama, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, K. Pedro, O. Prokofyev, G. Rakness, L. Ristori, E. Sexton-Kennedy, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, N. Strobbe, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, M. Verzocchi, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Whitbeck, Y. Wu

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, USA

D. Acosta, P. Avery, P. Bortignon, D. Bourilkov, A. Brinkerhoff, A. Carnes, M. Carver, D. Curry, S. Das, R.D. Field, I.K. Furic, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, J.F. Low, P. Ma, K. Matchev, H. Mei, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rank, L. Shchutska, D. Sperka, L. Thomas, J. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yelton

University of Florida, Gainesville, USA

S. Linn, P. Markowitz, G. Martinez, J.L. Rodriguez

Florida International University, Miami, USA

A. Ackert, T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Bein, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, H. Prosper, A. Santra, R. Yohay

Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

M.M. Baarmand, V. Bhopatkar, S. Colafranceschi, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, T. Roy, F. Yumiceva

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, USA

M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, D. Berry, R.R. Betts, I. Bucinskaite, R. Cavanaugh, O. Evdokimov, L. Gauthier, C.E. Gerber, D.J. Hofman, K. Jung, I.D. Sandoval Gonzalez, N. Varelas, H. Wang, Z. Wu, M. Zakaria, J. Zhang

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, USA

B. Bilki⁷⁰, W. Clarida, K. Dilsiz, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, J.-P. Merlo, H. Mermerkaya⁷¹, A. Mestvirishvili, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷², A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, USA

I. Anderson, B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, D. Fehling, L. Feng, A.V. Gritsan, P. Maksimovic, J. Roskes, U. Sarica, M. Swartz, M. Xiao, Y. Xin, C. You

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA

A. Al-bataineh, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, J. Bowen, J. Castle, L. Forthomme, R.P. Kenny III, S. Khalil, A. Kropivnitskaya, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, M. Murray, S. Sanders, R. Stringer, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, USA

A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, Y. Maravin, A. Mohammadi, L.K. Saini, N. Skhirtladze, S. Toda

Kansas State University, Manhattan, USA

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, USA

C. Anelli, A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, B. Calvert, S.C. Eno, C. Ferraioli, J.A. Gomez, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng⁷³, R.G. Kellogg, T. Kolberg, J. Kunkle, A.C. Mignerey, F. Ricci-Tam, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, M.B. Tonjes, S.C. Tonwar

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, A. Apyan, V. Azzolini, R. Barbieri, A. Baty, R. Bi, K. Bierwagen, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, Z. Demiragli, L. Di Matteo, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, D. Hsu, Y. Iiyama, G.M. Innocenti, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, K. Krajczar, Y.S. Lai, Y.-J. Lee, A. Levin, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, C. Roland, G. Roland, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Tatar, M. Varma, D. Velicanu, J. Veverka, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch, M. Yang

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, USA

A.C. Benvenuti, R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, P. Hansen, S. Kalafut, S.C. Kao, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, S. Nourbakhsh, N. Ruckstuhl, R. Rusack, N. Tambe, J. Turkewitz

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Mississippi, Oxford, USA

E. Avdeeva, K. Bloom, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, R. Gonzalez Suarez, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, A. Malta Rodrigues, F. Meier, J. Monroy, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow, B. Stieger

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, USA

M. Alyari, J. Dolen, A. Godshalk, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, J. Kaisen, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, A. Hortiangtham, A. Massironi, D.M. Morse, D. Nash, T. Orimoto, R. Teixeira De Lima, D. Trocino, R.-J. Wang, D. Wood

Northeastern University, Boston, USA

S. Bhattacharya, O. Charaf, K.A. Hahn, A. Kumar, N. Mucia, N. Odell, B. Pollack, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Trovato, M. Velasco

Northwestern University, Evanston, USA

N. Dev, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, N. Kellams, K. Lannon, N. Marinelli, F. Meng, C. Mueller, Y. Musienko³⁸, M. Planer, A. Reinsvold, R. Ruchti, N. Rupprecht, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, M. Wolf, A. Woodard

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, USA

J. Alimena, L. Antonelli, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, S. Flowers, B. Francis, A. Hart, C. Hill, R. Hughes, W. Ji, B. Liu, W. Luo, D. Puigh, B.L. Winer, H.W. Wulsin

The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

S. Cooperstein, O. Driga, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, P. Hebda, D. Lange, J. Luo, D. Marlow, T. Medvedeva, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, A. Svyatkovskiy, C. Tully

Princeton University, Princeton, USA

S. Malik

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, USA

A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, S. Folgueras, L. Gutay, M.K. Jha, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, A. Khatiwada, D.H. Miller, N. Neumeister, J.F. Schulte, X. Shi, J. Sun, F. Wang, W. Xie

Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA

N. Parashar, J. Stupak

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, USA

A. Adair, B. Akgun, Z. Chen, K.M. Ecklund, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Guilbaud, W. Li, B. Michlin, M. Northup, B.P. Padley, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, Z. Tu, J. Zabel

Rice University, Houston, USA

B. Betchart, A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, Y.t. Duh, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, J. Han, O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, K.H. Lo, P. Tan, M. Verzetti

University of Rochester, Rochester, USA

A. Agapitos, J.P. Chou, Y. Gershtein, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, E. Halkiadakis, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli, S. Kyriacou, A. Lath, K. Nash, M. Osherson, H. Saka, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, D. Sheffield, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas, P. Thomassen, M. Walker

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, USA

A.G. Delannoy, M. Foerster, J. Heideman, G. Riley, K. Rose, S. Spanier, K. Thapa

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA

O. Bouhali⁷⁴, A. Celik, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, S. Dildick, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, E. Juska, T. Kamon⁷⁵, R. Mueller, Y. Pakhotin, R. Patel, A. Perloff, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov, A. Tatarinov, K.A. Ulmer

Texas A&M University, College Station, USA

N. Akchurin, C. Cowden, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, C. Dragoiu, P.R. Duderø, J. Faulkner, E. Gurpinar, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Libeiro, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, USA

S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, Q. Xu

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, USA

M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, J. Goodell, R. Hirosky, A. Ledovskoy, H. Li, C. Neu, T. Sinthuprasith, X. Sun, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, USA

C. Clarke, R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, J. Sturdy

Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

D.A. Belknap, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, S. Dasu, L. Dodd, S. Duric, B. Gomber, M. Grothe, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, P. Klabbers, A. Lanaro, A. Levine, K. Long, R. Loveless, T. Perry, G.A. Pierro, G. Polese, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, N. Smith, W.H. Smith, D. Taylor, N. Woods

University of Wisconsin - Madison, Madison, WI, USA

[†] Deceased.

¹ Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria.

² Also at State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China.

³ Also at Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien (IPHC), Université de Strasbourg, CNRS/IN2P3, Strasbourg, France.

⁴ Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.

⁵ Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil.

⁶ Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium.

⁷ Also at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany.

⁸ Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia.

⁹ Also at Helwan University, Cairo, Egypt.

¹⁰ Now at Zewail City of Science and Technology, Zewail, Egypt.

¹¹ Now at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt.

¹² Also at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt.

¹³ Now at Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

¹⁴ Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France.

¹⁵ Also at Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.

¹⁶ Also at Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.

¹⁷ Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland.

¹⁸ Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany.

¹⁹ Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany.

²⁰ Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany.

²¹ Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary.

²² Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.

²³ Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.

²⁴ Also at Indian Institute of Technology Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India.

²⁵ Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India.

²⁶ Also at Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhopal, India.

²⁷ Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India.

²⁸ Also at University of Ruhuna, Matara, Sri Lanka.

²⁹ Also at Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, Iran.

³⁰ Also at Yazd University, Yazd, Iran.

³¹ Also at Plasma Physics Research Center, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

³² Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy.

³³ Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, USA.

³⁴ Also at International Islamic University of Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

- ³⁵ Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia.
- ³⁶ Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico city, Mexico.
- ³⁷ Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland.
- ³⁸ Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia.
- ³⁹ Now at National Research Nuclear University 'Moscow Engineering Physics Institute' (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia.
- ⁴⁰ Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- ⁴¹ Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, USA.
- ⁴² Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia.
- ⁴³ Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, USA.
- ⁴⁴ Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia.
- ⁴⁵ Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia.
- ⁴⁶ Also at INFN Sezione di Roma; Università di Roma, Roma, Italy.
- ⁴⁷ Also at University of Belgrade, Faculty of Physics and Vinca Institute of Nuclear Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia.
- ⁴⁸ Also at Scuola Normale e Sezione dell'INFN, Pisa, Italy.
- ⁴⁹ Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece.
- ⁵⁰ Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia.
- ⁵¹ Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia.
- ⁵² Also at Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Bern, Switzerland.
- ⁵³ Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey.
- ⁵⁴ Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁵⁵ Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.
- ⁵⁶ Also at Cag University, Mersin, Turkey.
- ⁵⁷ Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁵⁸ Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey.
- ⁵⁹ Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁶⁰ Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey.
- ⁶¹ Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁶² Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey.
- ⁶³ Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁶⁴ Also at Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁶⁵ Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- ⁶⁶ Also at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom.
- ⁶⁷ Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.
- ⁶⁸ Also at Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, La Laguna, Spain.
- ⁶⁹ Also at Utah Valley University, Orem, USA.
- ⁷⁰ Also at Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, USA.
- ⁷¹ Also at Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey.
- ⁷² Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.
- ⁷³ Also at University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- ⁷⁴ Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar.
- ⁷⁵ Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea.